



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

JUNE MEETING, 1892.

THE stated meeting was held on Thursday, the 9th instant, at three o'clock, P. M., the President, Dr. GEORGE E. ELLIS, in the chair.

After the reading of the record of the last meeting, and of the list of donors to the Library during the past month, the PRESIDENT called attention to the publication of two new volumes by our senior Vice-President, Mr. Francis Parkman, and said:—

Among the numerous and miscellaneous objects of historic interest and value which for a full century have been gathering within our halls, as in their fitting depository, I think you will accord with me when I say that that rich and solid oaken cabinet with its contents, the "Parkman Papers," make the chief gem and treasure of our library. Both the cabinet and the papers are the munificent gift to us of our distinguished Vice-President, and they will be an enduring monument to his fame. Those stately folios, with others of like character and contents which may be added to them, contain much of the materials on which the zeal, the patience, the research, and the concentrated literary aims and genius of their collector and editor have been engaged for nearly half a century. He has won the distinction of being the foremost historian of our country; and I know of no historical writer in any other country whose pages surpass those of Mr. Parkman in fidelity to truth of narration, in interest, brilliancy, and vigor of subject, style, and spirit.

Our thoughts and interest are now turned with renewed appreciation upon that cabinet and its contents, because the great purpose for which these papers and much other material were gathered, and after their being put to the best use, has now been crowned by the publication of the last of a series of twelve noble volumes completing a life-labor of the author. In those volumes the most rigid exactions of veritable history and the most fascinating charms of romance unite their attrac-

tions. Most grateful is it for us in our fellowship here to recognize the grandly finished work of our honored associate, and to express to him our full appreciation of his success, and our felicitations that life and mental vigor have supplied his forces.

Mr. Parkman has been signally favored alike in the grandeur of his chosen subject, and in the opportunity of life to pursue and to finish it. We all know the physical impediments and disabilities under which his Spartan heroism has persevered in steady toil. But of these fetterings and constraints we may be silent, because he says so little about them himself, while there is not a trace of them to be found in the brilliant and vigorous glow and power of his pages. I recall but one of the distinguished writers of history whose period for work, from his first volume to his last, was as full as that of Mr. Parkman,—and that is Mr. Bancroft. Mackintosh and Fox, Macaulay and Green and Freeman, not to mention lesser names, left either unfinished or posthumously published works. Mr. Parkman's subject was chosen with a loyal ardor in his college days; and it was so grand a one as to carry inspiration with it for one who had genius and the power to deal ably with it.

It was to be the history of the stern and protracted struggle between France and England for mastery over this northern part of the New World. The stake involved the sway and fortune of an empire and a continent. Kings and statesmen, priests and soldiers, with armies and navies at command, and every type of humanity, courtier and savage, civilized and barbarous, farmer and trader, and white and red men hardly distinguishable in character and habit of life, were to fill the stage in a marvellous panorama of dramas. The Old World and the New were contrasted to be assimilated. The scenes of the exciting and tragic story were interchanging between the intrigues, jealousies, and rivalries of courts, to the depths of solemn primeval wildernesses, lonely, and impenetrable but by savage men and beasts. The scale of all things was grand, with wreathings of solemn mystery. It was among inland seas, embossed lakes, cataracts, and mighty rivers, opening continuous water-ways with occasional carrying-places, through the breadth and length of the continent. The primeval forests showed their successive growths, with only Nature to train them from birth to death; the once patriarchal giants lay

prostrate in their spongy mould, and in all stages of life vigor and decay were represented in their generations as by the sleeping tenants of an old churchyard. The archives of France, England, and Canada,—the depositories of official documents, commissions and instructions, reports of civil and military functionaries, with their bickerings and quarrels,—in all of which was to be traced the tangled web of state-craft, policy, intrigue, and jealousy, were the prime materials for the historian. Of lesser dignity, but often more richly and curiously communicative, were the masses of materials searched out by the marvellous quest and sagacious skill of the historian to supplement, fill in, and attest the matter of his pages. The private papers of every grade and quality of the actors, journals, diaries, letters, itineraries, and rude maps, with cautiously weighed traditions, enrich the text and notes. These paper materials, however, furnish only the warp, the longitudinal threads of Mr. Parkman's volumes. The woof, the cross threading of the narration, is wholly from the personality of the writer, to be filled in by quite another process than that of the study of documents. The intervals of enforced rest used by Mr. Parkman for mental discipline, for thought and discursive readings, and his passion for open-air life and wide roamings, are found to yield their richest results for his pen; the most zealous use of books and manuscript needed, that the narrative to be wrought from them should have in it the charm and aroma of the scenes, the actors and the incidents, the features and the groupings of primitive Nature and savage life. It is here that we recognize the relation between the qualities and aptitudes of the historian and the exactions of his theme. Mr. Parkman's readers own to the fascination which he throws over them as a spell in his picturings and interpretations of Nature, and of the wild roamers through its shades and depths. It will be for a generation of readers soon to follow our own to appreciate to the full the permanence which he has stamped on his pages, of features, scenes, and objects, and of aboriginal forms and ways of life which have all so strangely vanished, thrown into remoteness, displaced as irrevocable and inconceivable, in the present aspect of vast reaches of this continent. It is to Mr. Parkman's wide and wild wanderings, his tramps on the trail, his paddlings in the canoe, his life passed in Indian lodges,—it is to

his proclivity and aptitude for observation and interpretation, his eye and mind for Nature, his affinity and sympathy, well-nigh suggestive of heredity of relation to the aborigines,—that we are indebted for the fidelity, the vividness, and the intensely absorbing spirit of his written work. His apt and felicitous choice of epithets, his turn of a phrase, his colorings and tintings in his verbal paintings, make his type and paper glow with life. A conscientious principle and purpose assure his candor and impartiality.

The mystery and sadness of an extended tragedy invest his subject, which he interprets to us as a struggle between royal absolutism and popular freedom on this open continent. The tragic element is in the defiance of poetic justice, that France, with its priority in time, and vigor of enterprise in exploration and occupancy, seeming to have secured fortified titles to permanence of inheritance and rule here, has not a foothold on this continent. She floats her flag only on a small group of fishing islands.

Mr. CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, having been called on, read a supplemental paper on “The Genesis of the Massachusetts Town,” as follows:—

The Society will remember that at the meeting in January last a paper, at the time referred to as “lengthy and somewhat elaborate,” on the origin of the Massachusetts towns and the development of government by town-meeting was submitted by me; also that the whole subject, as well as the conclusions reached in the paper referred to, was discussed by Messrs. Goodell, Chamberlain, and Channing. The symposium, if so I may be permitted to call it, then held, furnished matter sufficient to fill no less than ninety-one pages in the Society’s Proceedings,¹ and it might reasonably be supposed left the subject exhausted. I recur to it again, not at all for the purpose of enjoying the last word in a controversy, but because only recently have I seen the contributions of Messrs. Chamberlain and Channing in their matured and printed form, and the matter discussed is to my mind, and for reasons I propose presently to set forth, of such peculiar historical significance that I am solicitous lest my position in regard to it

¹ *Supra*, pp. 172–263.

should be in any way open to misapprehension. I will further add that certain expressions in the printed remarks of both Judge Chamberlain and Professor Channing lead me to apprehend that I failed to make myself clear at least to them; and if I failed to do so to them, still more must I have failed with others.

Stated generally, my endeavor in the paper referred to was to show that the whole political system of Massachusetts, State and town, was what we now call "a new departure." Up to the time the charter of 1629 was granted, the origin of political institutions had to be sought in the ecclesiastical and feudal systems; but those of Massachusetts, on the contrary, must be looked for in the growing commercial activity, and the organizations adapted thereto, then coming into general use. In other words, unconsciously and by mere chance, in the case of Massachusetts the future was divined, — the old was cast loose from, and the destiny of the community called into being was thrown in with the new. Nor is this a mere sounding phrase; for, as the years went on, the distinction meant a great deal, — it meant in the slow process of human evolution the difference between a pure democracy, founded on freedom of thought and the equality of man before the law, and a government recognizing distinctions of caste or priestly domination.

Accordingly, in the paper submitted by me at the January meeting, my contention, based on a careful analysis of original records, was that in Massachusetts the town system had been the natural outgrowth and sequence of the colonial system, — that it was based on the corporate principle, and that "in the original establishment of the town governments and their progressive development to meet the increasing requirements of a growing community the analogy of the charter was closely followed. The body of freemen or inhabitants constituted the General Court of the town, subsequently called the general town-meeting; and the townsmen, later on the selectmen, were the board of assistants, or, as they would now be called, directors." Upon this point, which I regard as of much historical significance, Judge Chamberlain says: —

"I do not perceive the analogy which Mr. Adams perceives between the General Court and Court of Assistants on the one hand, and the 'inhabitants' and 'selectmen,' on the other, in respect to the subjects,

or to the modes of their action severally, — certainly it was not institutional; nor do I think that ‘freemen or inhabitants’ are interchangeable terms equally descriptive of the same class of people; nor that ‘the inhabitants of the towns were those owning lands, — the freeholders, — who were all members of the congregation’; nor that ‘inhabitants’ of towns ‘were in the nature of stockholders in a modern corporation.’ To me these and some similar expressions convey ideas foreign to the homely simplicity of those early people and the nature of their affairs.”¹

It is not necessary for the purpose of establishing the historical fact for which I contend to go into an abstruse discussion of institutions. I do not suppose that the earliest English immigrants bestowed much if any thought on abstract questions, at least those not theological in character. They did not sit down and argue out principles of government, formally incorporating the results of their discussions into laws and constitutions. If I take in the facts correctly, they simply followed, in the development of their institutions, what may most aptly be called the line of least political resistance. The form of colonial government prescribed in their charter was before them and in common use by them; and it was at once simple, familiar, and effective. Founded on the corporate and commercial basis, its organization consisted of a General Court of Proprietors, which at its stated meetings transacted legislative business on matters of common concernment, and elected an executive committee of so-called assistants, to which committee the details of government were intrusted. So far there is no room for difference of opinion. The record is clear, and speaks for itself. Then followed the process of political differentiation. The towns one by one came into existence; and I submit that it is of no consequence whatever whether the result was intentional or otherwise, — whether a model was followed, or whether it was a case of accidental resemblance or analogous development, — the fact none the less remains and is indisputably stamped on the record, that the town system resembled in every essential respect the colonial system, — resembled it as a child resembles a parent. Founded on the corporate principle, — with an element of common as well as individual ownership, — the Plantation, as the town was called, was governed in all matters of local and common con-

¹ *Supra*, pp. 240, 241.

cernment by a court of Proprietors, which later developed into the town-meeting, and this court almost from the first elected an executive committee to which all details of government were intrusted.

If under these circumstances a model was not followed, the results, I submit, were exactly what they would have been if the charter organization as a model had been followed.

Passing over as immaterial the other points of difference between us in the extract I have just quoted, I am not sure I understand what Judge Chamberlain has in mind when he says : —

“ I do not perceive the analogy which Mr. Adams perceives between the General Court and Court of Assistants on the one hand, and the ‘inhabitants’ and ‘selectmen,’ on the other, in respect to the subjects, or to the modes of their action severally, — certainly it was not institutional.”

“ Institutional,” as I understand the word, merely means that which is elementary in institutions. The question is immaterial so far as the essential point in my contention is concerned ; but none the less, if my definition is correct, and I understand what Judge Chamberlain means by “ institutional,” I find myself obliged to take issue with him ; even though experience has taught me that so doing is, on matters connected with early Massachusetts history and its underlying principles, not unattended by the risk of finding myself in the wrong. As I read the early town records, — especially those of Boston, Dorchester, and Dedham, — the distinguishing features of their systems were the corporate existence of plantations, the local business of which was managed by executive boards chosen by bodies of proprietors in General Court assembled, — the whole bearing the closest possible resemblance to the system prescribed in the King Charles charter, and then in regular operation before the eyes of the local plantation proprietors, — and these common features of both systems seem to me nothing if not institutional or elementary. It was moreover in the towns, and especially in Boston, — with its general courts of inhabitants, or freemen, choosing “ the 10 to manage the affaires of the towne,” — it was here, and in this form of government, that the institutional methods prescribed for the colony in the charter were

followed and preserved, while in the government of the colony itself the delegate system had to be improvised, and so to speak injected into it, to meet the exigencies of growth and diffusion. If therefore the earliest system of government in use in the original plantations, or towns, as set forth in the records from which I quoted last January, was not "institutional" under the charter, then it must be conceded the unknown and undiscoverable paternity of that system sets at defiance every generally accepted principle of hereditary resemblance.

I pass now to Professor Channing's caveat against what he refers to as "Mr. Adams's Massachusetts Charter theory."¹ Professor Channing says:—

"One other point occurs to me. Mr. Adams maintains that the charter was the model on which the town system was based. I think there are two objections to that: first, the towns were not based on any model; they grew by the exercise of English common-sense and political experience, combined with the circumstances of the place. Secondly, and much more important, I think, the freemen in general were by no means so in love with the general government of the Company at that time as to wish to model their town government upon it. To make this clear, let us see how the charter was being interpreted by those in power during these years. In 1631 it was voted that the Assistants only should be elected by the freemen, the Governor and Deputy-Governor being elected by the Assistants out of their own number. In 1631 also the Assistants levied a tax, which gave rise to a protest from the people of Watertown; and the protesters came to Boston on Feb. 17, 1631-32, when Winthrop expounded the nature of the Assistants' power."²

Again I find myself compelled to take issue with Professor Channing, a thing I am always most reluctant to do. So far from drawing the same conclusions he has drawn from the incident he refers to in the above extract from his paper, I draw from it conclusions of a wholly opposite character. He says the early settlers were not "so in love" with the general government of the Company at that time as to wish to model their town government upon it. On the contrary, it is the one recognized and accepted fact of early Massachusetts history, that the settlers were "so in love" with their charter

¹ *Supra*, p. 244.

² *Supra*, p. 262.

that they considered it as the very palladium of their rights and liberties, and stood ready to resist by every means in their power any attempt to deprive them of it. In the very case cited by Mr. Channing the freemen of Watertown demanded a view of the charter, not because they "were by no means in love" with it, or the general form of government prescribed in it, but because that form of government was being departed from without their consent. They relied upon its provisions as their protection against an attempted usurpation on the part of the magistrates. Their rights they held were set forth in the charter, and they insisted in having them,—they appealed to the fundamental law. The case cited by Professor Channing in reality, therefore, is against his caveat and in favor of my contention.

But Professor Channing also says that "the towns were not based on any model." Here, as in the case of Judge Chamberlain's criticism already referred to, it is not necessary for the establishing of my contention to go so far as to talk of "models," — that word implies too much. Men who in disposing of the practical affairs of life as they arise follow the nomenclature and methods to which they are accustomed, cannot properly be said to follow "a model"; nor did the early New England immigrants when they organized their plantations and courts of proprietors in the strict verbal sense of the word "model" adopt the charter institutions. They did not sit down as the modern constitution-maker does with documents, treatises, and precedents before them, and turn out as from a machine some patent and approved governmental system. They did nothing in any way resembling this; on the contrary, simple, busy men, engaged in a matter-of-fact way in a very stern struggle for subsistence and shelter, they in the management of their local affairs merely in a natural way followed what I have described as the line of least political resistance along the paths most familiar to them. Nevertheless, in so doing, I submit as a matter of fact, — though unnecessary to my argument, — they did practically work on the "model" of the Charter then staring them in the face; and the fact that they did work on that model is, moreover, clearly shown in the records from which I so fully quoted in my January paper. Indeed, they followed the model so closely that they preserved not only its spirit and original form,

but at first even its nomenclature of "courts," "plantations," "planters," and "proprietors." The General Court in the case of the towns was, and remained, what the charter intended it should be, a meeting of the whole body of proprietors; in the case of the colony it soon ceased to be a meeting of the whole body of proprietors, or freemen, and became, and still is, a delegate body. Thus, if I correctly read the ancient records, it was in the towns, and not in the colony as a whole, that the institutional system provided in the charter was preserved and perpetuated.

Before dismissing this subject, as I suppose forever so far as I personally am concerned, I have a single word more to say. It may seem to many that I have occupied over it more of the time of the Society than its importance deserves, and by so doing swelled unnecessarily the fast-growing bulk of our printed Proceedings. This is very possible; though, of course, I do not think so: but perhaps I have an inordinate opinion of the value and importance of the story of Massachusetts from the point of view of general history. On this subject I ten years ago expressed myself as follows in the preface to a privately printed but never published volume; and neither the time which has since elapsed nor a closer and more continuous study of the subject has led to any modification of my views:

"I do not think the history of any community during an equal period is hereafter destined to outrank in importance the history of Massachusetts from the year 1620 to 1865. . . .

"This is a broad statement, and I am well aware that it will sound like one of those exaggerated expressions of State pride naturally to be expected from members of a small community. Yet there are not many communities to which it has been given to impart to the race a ruling idea or truth; and in those rare cases where it has been so given, the histories of Judea and of Attica should suffice to prove that bigness is not essential to the mission. By a ruling idea or truth, I mean some fundamental principle of political or social conduct which — slowly formulated, and yet more slowly forcing its way into general acceptance — ultimately changes the whole complexion of history. I confidently submit that Massachusetts is one of the half-dozen communities which have had such a message to deliver to mankind, and have delivered it.

"The Hebrews developed the idea of the one God and his commandments, — an idea and a code which have since become the basis of all modern law and civilization. The Athenians next came forward,

embodying the principle of popular government through discussion. It is more than two thousand years since they delivered their message, and it is only now struggling into general acceptance. Rome developed that idea of imperial organization which is the key-note of modern as opposed to ancient history. England originated parliamentary or representative government, and brought it into practical use. It was reserved for Massachusetts to assert the absolute equality of men before the law.

“That idea was the offspring of the English Commonwealth. Its godfathers were Hampden and Milton and Cromwell. It found inarticulate expression in the death of King Charles. No portion of the world was, however, then ready to accept so startling a paradox. All existing habits, traditions, institutions,—social, political, religious,—recoiled from it. It seemed like an absurdity on its face, to assert that the peasant who turned the clod was, before the law, or anywhere else, the equal of the lord at whose castle’s gate he lived, or of the priest who represented God. Such an idea no more found acceptance with the peasant than it did with the lord or the priest. Indeed, the first, no long time before, had been a serf,—an adjunct to the soil and inseparable from it. Though a protest against human inequality, the English Commonwealth was, accordingly, only a passing protest. Law, usage, tradition, were forces too powerful to be at once overcome, and the hereditary, privileged-class principle reasserted itself. But meanwhile the germinal idea of the Commonwealth had been transferred across the Atlantic. It was there planted in Massachusetts, where it slowly developed under the most favoring of possible conditions. At first it was hardly more received here than it had been in England. The magistrates talked of the ‘common people’; and one code of criminal law applied to them, while another applied to the gentry. But there was no king and no noble in the land, and in the church and the town-meeting all stood upon a footing of absolute equality. Slavery also existed for a time; but it was only in its least objectionable form. No large gangs of bondsmen ever worked under overseers. The system never was organized, and it died a natural death. Thus, when the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780 went into effect, all the opposing forces had disappeared, and the principle of human equality before the law, theoretically enunciated in the Declaration, was a thing in practice in New England. The country, as a whole, accepted it only subject to limitations. It applied but to white men. Then in due course of time followed the long slavery struggle, in which Massachusetts was arrayed against Virginia, the Puritan idea against the idea of caste. Not until 1865 was the question definitely settled.

“That this principle, so recently established as the rule of this continent, is destined to become the rule in all civilized countries, now

admits of no question. It is a principle as fundamental as that of the one God, or as government through discussion, or as imperial organization, or as representative rule. As a theory reduced to practice, and made to dominate a continent, it is the contribution of Massachusetts. The question then may not unfairly be put: Has any other community made a greater contribution?"

With this estimate of what I may almost term the supreme historical importance of the Massachusetts record, the single point in it dwelt upon at such length in our January symposium and again now strikes me as essential to the whole. That which it has been sought to establish is the vital initial fact, giving shape to all that thereafter ensued,—the fact so often stated by me,—that Massachusetts was founded not on feudal or ecclesiastical models, but as a corporate commercial enterprise, with all that the phrase to-day implies; and, further, that this corporate, democratic, commercial organization was not confined to the colonial government organized under the charter, but, propagated through the charter, pervaded the town system, and as a consequence, every remotest portion of the New England body politic. Thus King Charles's charter was seminal, and through and by it—no one designing, no one anticipating—a people, following the lines of least political resistance to a conclusion the logical outcome of elementary principles, evolved in process of time a result of momentous human importance. In other words, once more to repeat myself, in the organization of the political system of Massachusetts under the corporate, commercial, commonplace, democratic forms prescribed in King Charles's charter of 1629, the future was unconsciously divined,—it was nineteenth-century daylight first faintly dawning in the earlier years of the seventeenth century.

Mr. SAMUEL F. McCLEARY presented to the Society a Commission issued to "Edward Proctor of Boston as Captain in the regiment of militia whereof John Erving is Colonel."¹ The commission is dated Feb. 26, 1772, and is signed by Thomas Hutchinson, the last of the Royal Civil Governors. Edward Proctor was a man of considerable note in his day. He resided and kept a store at the corner of Fish Street and Proc-

¹ John Erving was a Loyalist. He graduated at Harvard College in 1747. In 1776 he went to England, and died at Bath in 1816, aged 89.

tor's Lane, which was named for him. This store was known as "The Schooner," from the representation of a vessel of that class over the door. He was a prominent member of St. Andrew's Lodge, and was a very active member of the Boston Tea Party, being appointed at a town meeting, Nov. 27, 1773, chairman of a special watch or committee of twenty-five men to see that the tea on board the "Dartmouth" was not landed by night or day. He was the reputed author of the pseudo-Mohawk proclamation which called for the assembly of the Indians and others to destroy the tea. The regiment of militia of which Edward Proctor was appointed captain was known as the Boston Regiment, and was composed of some of the most prominent citizens, many of whom became ardent patriots and officers in the Revolution. At the date of this commission the field-officers of the regiment were John Erving, a son-in-law of Governor Shirley, John Leverett, and Thomas Dawes, the last being the architect of Brattle Street Church.¹

Mr. McCleary also presented a specimen sheet of Washington's private letter-paper. It is of foolscap size, and bears in water-lines the name of George Washington inscribed on a garter arranged in a circular form and surmounted with his familiar crest. Within the garter is seated a female figure holding a Phrygian Cap of Liberty. There is no water-line date on the paper; but it is probably post-Revolutionary in its origin.

He also submitted a copy of an original letter dated Orange-town, N. Y., Sept. 29, 1780, written by Lieut. John Whiting, of the Twelfth Massachusetts Regiment, Colonel Brewer commanding, reciting the treason of Arnold, and the capture of Major André, which had taken place on September 23.

Lieut. John Whiting, the writer of the letter, served with distinction through the Revolutionary War, and by successive promotions became a brigadier-general, in which capacity he served with the Massachusetts troops in suppressing Shays's Rebellion. He was a citizen of Lancaster in this State, and this letter was written to his brother Timothy, also a citizen of Lancaster. The original letter is in the possession of the family of the late Paul Willard, of Charlestown, who married a daughter of Timothy Whiting. The letter is somewhat lengthy, and gives an account of the capture of André as current in the American camp at the time.

¹ Thomas Dawes, an ardent patriot, was the father of Judge Thomas Dawes, of the Suffolk Probate Court. He died Jan. 2, 1809.

CAMP ORANGETOWN, Sept. 29, 1780.

DEAR BROTHER, — Yours dated Sept. 14 came to hand the 25th inst. accompanied with others equally satisfactory, for which please to receive my thanks most gratefully proffered.

The agreeable situation you are in as related in both your letters not only gives me pleasure while perusing (as is common on similar occasions) but continues to be very satisfactory. I wish your agreeable situation may be lasting and the iron hand of fate long procrastinate the stroke which cuts the golden chain of pleasure.

How shall I begin to unfold the blackest Treason ever known in the American War, plotted by Major General Arnold who commanded that important post at which you had long performed an assiduous duty and have been witness with what indefatigable zeal many Persons have endeavored to render defensible? Before I proceed let me congratulate you on being released from that department ere it was thrown into such a confused manner as it now is.

How long General Arnold has been plotting with the Enemy is with us uncertain: the first we know of (which is but just discovered) is, his holding a conference with Mr. Andrie, Adjutant General to the British Army near Joshua Smith's house not far from King's ferry, after which Mr. Andrie changed clothes with Smith at his house, and both visited our Army which was not very difficult, Smith being an intimate acquaintance of General Howe, and had often dined with some other of our General Officers. When they had sufficiently reconnoitred our Army Mr. Andrie repairs to General Arnold's quarters at Robertson's House, and by some means got a plan of all the Works, Strength of the Garrison, the Stores, proceedings of a Council of Officers lately held at Head Quarters and in short everything that could be of any advantage to the Enemy. Thus equipped, being also furnished with a horse and a pass signed Benedict Arnold M. G. the purport of which was that John Anderson had permission to pass to the Lines and as much further as he should judge necessary, Mr. Andrie sat off for New York; having rode as far as the Lines by sunset, two Men, who have served as Guides to our advanced Parties, arming themselves, one of them advanced towards him ordering him to Stand. Mr. Andrie thinking himself below all the guards asked the Man if he belonged to the lower party or upper, to which he answered the latter: then says Mr. Andrie, I am a British Officer, showing him a gold watch, which signified as much that no American officer had one: the other Man coming up, they ordered him to dismount: finding himself caught, he began to offer bribes, which they obstinately refused: seeing his gold watch, horse, &c with one hundred guineas could have no effect on them he offered to bind himself by the most sacred covenant to give them whatever they would demand, to make them Gentlemen of independent fortunes

when they arrived at New York, all of which did not prevent these inflexible Patriots from carrying him to L. Colonel Jemmerson¹ who commanded Col. Shelding's² regiment of Dragoons at N. Salem. Col. Jemmerson supposed the pass to be a forgery. Mr. Andrie professed to be perfectly innocent, demanded of him to be sent to and examined by Gen^l Arnold, who alone knew his business.

Very providentially it happened that Col. Jemmerson thought best to send papers of such importance to his Excellency General Washington at Hartford, which he did by an Express, who coming near Hartford was informed his Excellency was returning by way of Fish-Kill: the Express followed but did not reach him till after he had got to West Point.

When his Excellency with his Train came to Mandeville's they viewed the Redouts on the East side, while two Aids went on to Genl. Arnold's quarters.

Genl. Arnold had just received a letter from Col. Jemmerson informing him of his taking up — John Anderson with a forged pass. It seems Col. Jemmerson, finding the Express gone so long, wrote to Genl. Arnold, and sent the Prisoner afterwards. The Traitor saw by this letter he should soon be discovered, desired the *Aids de camp* to excuse him to his Excellency for an hour while he went to West Point having some business that required his presence immediately: then going upstairs told his Wife he had received a letter which obliged him to take his farewell of her and his Country forever: She fainted, but he left her, repaired to his Barge and ordered his Men to row him down the River as Speedy as possible. His Excellency came to the house just after, was told General Arnold had gone to West Point on some urgent business, he concluded to follow, and return to dine with him: coming to West Point General Arnold had not been there: about the same time the Express from Col. Jemmerson arrived and delivered the papers. His Excellency immediately dispatched two of his Aids to Verplank's Point with express orders to stop Gen. Arnold, but they arrived some time after he had passed that under pretence of a flag and gone on board the Sloop Vulture which lay up by Tyler's point. Thus escaped Benedict Arnold from the vengeance of his injured Country to linger out a contemptible life among a people who will ever despise him for his perfidy.

When Mr. Andrie was brought to Robertson's more of the plot was unravelled. Smith was sent for and taken at Fishkill. The Garrison at West Point were ordered under Arms: orders came to Major Gen. Green which put the Pennsylvania division on their march for West Point, the rest of the Army in readiness to march at the shortest notice.

Let me now relate the sacrifice which Arnold intended to make, although it should stun your ears.

¹ Lieut.-Col. David Jameson. He died Oct. 2, 1839.

² Col. Elisha Sheldon, of Connecticut.

The night of the 25 inst. Col. Robertson¹ with five hundred Men was to pass by Verplank's point dressed like our Troops under a pretence of a reinforcement from our Army: at Robertson's house Arnold was to be surprised. General Washington, the Marquis de la Fayette, the Chevalier de la Luzerne, ambassador, B. Genl. Knox, all their aids and attendants were to be taken, after which they were to take possession of West Point, which [torn] much resistance the Garrison being reduced (would you believe it) to about three hundred Militia, besides Artillery, having under various pretences been distributed *here* and *there* — two hundred cutting wood at one place. The soldiers in the Garrison had not more than two Cartridges per man, having been divested of them under the plausible pretence that two was enough to stand on Sentry: had they more they would waste them — no alarm post was assigned to any but the Artillery. You see how easily this might have taken place; but can you discern how near the brink of ruin we were? Men at the head of our military affairs with illustrious Foreigners captured; the communication between the States cut off: — The treachery was to be kept a secret and Arnold after receiving his reward was to have his Parole and return to his Seat in Philadelphia to spend in his former luxurious manner the Judas-like gain. Mr. Andrie and Mr. Smith are to be tried today. Andrie was one of their most promising officers in the british Service and had attained the rank of Major from a Lieutenant by particular merits.

How propitious! how merciful! is indulgent heaven in [torn and illegible] the almost inconceivable depravity of human nature which cautions [torn] not to rest secure in human faith without suffering us to purchase our [torn] dearly by experience. Would time allow [torn] further relation of so despicable [torn] how the public Stores were disposed of by Genl. Arnold.

Mrs. Warren lent him twenty-two thousand dollars which he left unpaid.

Many Persons say they were not deceived in Genl. Arnold: I confess I had a good opinion of him as an Officer in the Field, but ever thought him to be ambitious and possest of a great degree of avarice and luxury. Some imagine his profuse manner of living had so involved him in debt that poverty urged him to it. Enough upon so perfidious a person. Leave him to his fate and admire the Man who bears to be honest in the worst of times.

I ask you to excuse my answering some part of your letter this time. If I have been too prolix (which I am very conscious of) I have been particular and such matters are seldom ever related minutely in public papers. I have not seen Lieut. Shaw since I received yours

¹ Col. Beverley Robinson, a Loyalist, whose mansion on the Hudson was occupied by Arnold as his headquarters. He fled with Arnold to England, and died at Thornbury in 1792.

nor can I give him timely notice of Dr. Wingate's departure. Many Gentlemen enquire after and send their compliments to you. Capt. Burbank standing by insists on his name being mentioned.

I am, dear Brother, yours affectionately,

JOHN WHITING.

TIMOTHY WHITING Juneor. Esq.
Lancaster.

Dr. SAMUEL A. GREEN made the following remarks on a small volume which he presented to the library of the Society. He said that it had once belonged to our late associate, Dr. Thomas H. Webb, as it bears his autograph signature on the titlepage. It was published originally as a pamphlet, but has since been bound. The little book is entitled : “ RELIGION | AND | PATRIOTISM | The CONSTITUENTS of a Good | SOLDIER. | A | SERMON | Preached to | Captain OVERTON'S Independant | Company of Volunteers, raised in | *Hanover County, Virginia, August 17, 1755.* | By SAMUEL DAVIES, A. M. Minister of | the Gospel there.” ||

PHILADELPHIA, Printed : LONDON ; Re-printed for J. BUCKLAND, in *Pater-noster Row*, J. WARD at the *King's-Arms* in *Cornhill*, and T. FIELD in *Cheapside*. 1756. 8vo. pp. 38.

The writer in his day was a noted minister of Virginia ; but the interest in the sermon lies wholly in the fact that it contains a remarkable prediction concerning General Washington, made twenty years before the Revolution. In preaching to the military company, Mr. Davies says : —

“ Our Continent is like to become the Seat of War ; and we, for the future (till the sundry *European* Nations that have planted Colonies in it, have fixed their Boundaries by the Sword) have no other Way left to defend our Rights and Privileges. And has God been pleased to diffuse some Sparks of this Martial Fire through our Country ? I hope he has : And though it has been almost extinguished by so long a Peace, and a Deluge of Luxury and Pleasure, now I hope it begins to kindle : And may I not produce you my Brethren, who are engaged in this Expedition, as Instances of it ? ” (Pages 11, 12.)

In a foot-note to this paragraph he adds : —

“ As a remarkable Instance of this, I may point out to the Public that heroic Youth Col. *Washington*, whom I cannot but hope Providence has hitherto preserved in so signal a Manner, for some important Service to his Country.” (Page 12.)

The sermon was preached only a few weeks after the engagement which resulted in Braddock's Defeat, where Washington behaved with signal gallantry ; and the allusion in the note is to that action, as well as to the battle of the Great Meadows in the summer of the preceding year.

Dr. Green also called attention to a manuscript list of Micmac names of places, lakes, and rivers in Nova Scotia, with their meanings, which was compiled by Miss Elizabeth Frame, of Shubenacadie, N. S., and given by her to the Library. The names are nearly three hundred in number.

Rev. Dr. EDWARD J. YOUNG then said :—

I desire to communicate the following letter, which was written by a young Quaker of Philadelphia, on his first visit to Boston, ninety-one years ago. In consequence of terrific gales, the ship in which he sailed was more than five weeks on her voyage, which was as long a time as is now necessary for a packet to go from New York to Hamburg. On his arrival here, he was favorably impressed by the people ; but, coming from a city which was laid out almost in parallelograms, he naturally was not pleased with our crooked streets.

This letter mentions briefly several of the principal objects of interest in the town. The crescent-shaped block of houses named the "Tontine," which was situated on what was afterwards called Franklin Place, is especially praised. The new Faneuil Hall Market, popularly known as Quincy Market, was not then built. Charles River Bridge, leading to Charlestown, had been opened in 1786 ; and West Boston Bridge, leading to Cambridge, in 1793. The Beacon monument or column, which is alluded to, was completed in 1790 ; and the new State House was finished in 1798.

Of Charles Bulfinch, the well-known designer of both these last-named structures, and who was a member of this Society, I have heard an anecdote which may not be generally known. His son, Stephen Greenleaf Bulfinch, who told it to me, said that, after leaving college, he wished to be an architect. But his father dissuaded him, saying that most of the States already had their capitols erected, and that if he should devote himself to this occupation, there would probably not be enough for him to do. Accordingly he became a clergyman. Inas-

much as there are to-day more than two hundred architects in Boston, and not a church or schoolhouse or warehouse or private dwelling of any considerable size is constructed except according to plans furnished by competent talent for the purpose, the remark of Mr. Bulfinch shows how little he anticipated the future rapid increase of wealth in this country, and the opportunities which would exist for members of his profession.

BOSTON, 5 mo. 21st 1801.

DEAR SISTERS,—It may perhaps surprise you to hear from me at Boston, without you have heard of my going, from your Brothers in Philadelphia; and still more perhaps you would be surprised if I was to give you some description of the place and my journey, which I would have done some time since, if I had been well enough to have seen much of the town after my arrival there.

I left Philadelphia the 13th of the 3d month, and after being at sea about 18 days we experienced a very severe storm in which we were cast away on the Jersey shore near Amboy. We were there ten days, getting the vessel off the shore, when we again set sail; but before we had been out more than a week, we underwent as severe a storm as the one which we were cast away in. In this last storm we were drove into the Gulf of Florida and almost to the West Indies, and there were 11 Eastern coasting vessels lost. We however weathered it out, and arrived safe in Boston on the 19th of the 4th mo. after a passage of thirty-six days.

In my opinion the manners of the people here are much more hospitable than they are in Philadelphia; but the place itself is no comparison, the streets are extremely narrow and so crooked that it is impossible to see the length of a Philadelphia Square before you in any one street in Boston.

There are a great number of public places of worship, and some very handsome public buildings, among which are the New State House and a New Alms House; the former, there is nothing in Philadelphia to equal it; the latter, the Hospital in Philadelphia is much handsomer. They have one very handsome street here on which are the Tontine buildings, which is a great ornament to the town. It contains a monument to the memory of Dr. Benjamin Franklin. In this street is kept the Boston Library, which is very small in comparison to the one in Philadelphia. Their market house is very bad.

There is a fine wharf here called the Long Wharf. It extends from the street the amazing length of 1743 feet into the harbour in a straight line, and the breadth is 104 feet. On this wharf there is a well from which vessels are supplied with fresh water, surrounded by salt water.

The view of the town, as it is approached by water, is very handsome. The State House on Beacon hill, which is in the middle of the town, is so high that it can be seen at the distance of fifty or sixty miles. There is a monument on this hill, on the bottom of which is written an inscription commemorating the most remarkable events during the American Revolution. There are two Bridges here, which are very useful and ornamental to Boston, called Charles River and West Boston bridges. The last stands on one hundred and eighty Piers, and is said to be nearly two miles in length, and has draws for the admission of vessels, and a number of lamps for evening passengers.

Excuse the length of my letter, but I could, if it would not be too long, make a great addition to it. For a description of the country, I believe you must wait until I have the pleasure of seeing your again.

Please give my love to Father and Mother, Brothers and Sisters.
from your affectionate Brother,

M. & E. Johnson }
New Garden. }

ROBERT JOHNSON.

Attention was called to a new volume of Collections which was ready for publication, comprising a selection from the correspondence of Wait Winthrop, with his portrait, and numerous fac-similes of autographs. Among the most important documents in the volume are an elaborate report on the method of procedure in the courts of Massachusetts, drawn up in 1700 for transmission to England, of which no copy now exists at the State House, and the plaintiff's brief in the famous case of *Winthrop v. Lechmere*, appealed from Connecticut to the privy council in England. There are also numerous letters and documents of one kind and another throwing light on the social, political, and economic condition of Massachusetts and Connecticut at the beginning of the eighteenth century.

Mr. R. C. WINTHROP, Jr., said: —

On the completion of successive volumes of selections from the Winthrop Papers, of which the one laid on the table to-day is the sixth, there has usually been a tacit understanding that, owing to the accumulation of partially examined material, the Committee would hold over and sooner or later be authorized to prepare another. In the present instance, however, it has been arranged that the existing Committee shall

now be relieved from further duties, they having been virtually in office about twelve years; during which time they have not merely edited three separate volumes, but have examined thousands of other manuscripts, of which they have rejected many as not worth printing, have communicated others at different times to the Proceedings, and have set aside the rest for the use of their successors. For reasons which I shall presently mention, it is not thought expedient to appoint a new Committee for several years to come, and in view of the uncertainty of human life and the possibility that the task may hereafter devolve upon members who have had no previous acquaintance with the subject, I have thought it prudent to prepare for convenient reference in our Proceedings a short statement of what has thus far been accomplished and of what remains to be done.

So few of us nowadays find time to interest themselves actively in the Society's work of publication, that it may be well to begin by alluding to the fact that we are in the habit of printing two distinct classes of historical material,—the first class being that which is actually owned or controlled by the Society; and the second class being the private property of members or other persons, who permit us to publish selections for the use of students. The Society owns or controls many Winthrop manuscripts, some of them of great value as autographs; but all considered worth printing were published long ago, and for the past thirty years the term "Winthrop Papers" has been conventionally applied to an exceptionally large number of letters and state-papers of the Colonial and early Provincial periods which came into my father's possession from two different sources, and which originally belonged to a still larger collection formerly preserved at New London by five generations of his family. During the Revolutionary War Gov. Jonathan Trumbull was allowed access to it by a great-uncle of mine, then its owner, and was permitted to take copies of a number of papers, and to borrow others, for purposes connected with Connecticut history. Trumbull died in 1785, without having completed this undertaking, and my aforesaid great-uncle having predeceased him, the latter's heirs appear to have made no effort for the recovery of the material thus loaned; so that when, in 1794, the bulk of Trumbull's papers was given by his family to this Society, they were found to

contain many Winthrop papers which had become separated from the New London Collection. Some of them subsequently perished in the conflagration which destroyed much valuable property of the Society in 1825, while others will be found printed in the first volume of our Third Series of Collections and in the ninth volume of our Fifth Series.

It happened, however, that before we came into possession of the Trumbull Papers they had been consulted by Dr. Benjamin Trumbull, the historian, and by Noah Webster, the lexicographer, the latter of whom was so much interested in a copy Governor Trumbull had made of the first and second manuscript volumes of Governor Winthrop's "History of New England" (often styled Winthrop's Journal), that, with the consent of the Winthrop family and the Trumbull heirs, he prepared it for the press, and in 1790 it was published at Hartford, in a single volume, by Elisha Babcock. Twenty-six years later, in 1816, the third of Governor Winthrop's manuscript volumes unexpectedly came to light in the tower of the Old South Church, it having been loaned to and never returned by the Rev. Thomas Prince, who died in 1758; and, as many of us remember, our former President, Mr. Savage, devoted years of his life to properly editing the entire work from the original manuscripts, eventually publishing it in two volumes, the first of which appeared in 1825, the second in 1826, and in the appendices to both of which were printed many family letters and other papers obtained by him from one of our Corresponding Members, the late Francis Bayard Winthrop, of New Haven, who had inherited a fragment of the New London Collection. In this laborious work Mr. Savage was much assisted by another of our members, Mr. James Bowdoin, who subsequently undertook single-handed to prepare for the press an important portion of the same collection, then belonging to his father, Hon. Thomas Lindall Winthrop; and at the time of his death, in 1833, he had finished deciphering and copying one hundred and thirty-five early Colonial letters of exceptional value. My father was then in active political life, and had not yet developed a taste for historical pursuits; it was not until more than ten years afterward that, having in the mean time been elected to this Society, he communicated to it the material prepared by his brother, which occupies more than two hundred pages of the ninth and tenth volumes of our Third Series of Collections.

Then followed a long interval during which my father was otherwise engaged; but in 1855, having been elected President of the Society and having virtually retired from public life, he endeavored to procure the loan, for historical purposes, of that portion of the original collection which still remained at New London and belonged to his cousin, the late William Henry Winthrop. In this he was unsuccessful; but at the latter's death, in 1860, his papers passed into my father's possession, and proved to be much more numerous and far more important than had previously been supposed, though they had suffered sadly from damp and, in some cases, from mice. My father realized how difficult it would be for him, consistently with his other occupations, to make an exhaustive examination of this mass of new material; and after consulting with Mr. Savage and Mr. Charles Deane, the following plan was adopted: My father undertook to have gradually arranged in folio volumes his entire collection of Winthrop Papers (including those which had previously come to him from his father), and after reserving for his personal use those immediately relating to Gov. John Winthrop the elder (upon whose Life he was then engaged), as well as the right of making separate use of whatever he might see fit hereafter to select, he agreed to place the balance for a considerable period at the service of a Committee of this Society, to be called the Committee on the Winthrop Papers, whose duty should be to edit selections for the use of historical students; but it was provided that, in view of the restricted income of our publishing-funds, a separate vote of the Society should be required to authorize the publication of each successive volume. In accordance with this arrangement, in February, 1861, a Committee was appointed, consisting of my father, Mr. Charles Deane, and Dr. Chandler Robbins, who forthwith went to work and laid their first volume on our table in March, 1863. Receiving permission to continue without delay, they produced their second volume in January, 1865, when they were again empowered to prepare another. This third volume lagged from various causes, the work growing harder as it proceeded; and the Committee, having been nine years in office, made up their minds that they needed reinforcement. They were fortunate in securing the services of our present Treasurer, Mr. C. C. Smith; and it was largely due to his

assistance that they were able to present their third volume in June, 1871. Then occurred a very long interval during which hardly anything was done. My father was a good deal absent in Europe and elsewhere, Mr. Deane was very busy, Dr. Robbins's eyesight had begun to fail, and the Society was committed to other publications for which its means barely sufficed. In the winter of 1879-1880 I first began, at my father's desire, to take an active part in the work, and it was decided to take a fresh start. It was arranged that the three senior members of the Committee should retire; and in April, 1880, a new Committee was appointed, consisting of Mr. Smith, Mr. George Dexter (then our Recording Secretary), and myself. The Society's income being at a low ebb, I agreed to defray the expense of a fourth volume in order to avoid further delay, and we produced it in September, 1882. We then preferred to wait until the Society should be again in funds; and it was not until January, 1887, that we were empowered to proceed, Prof. Edward Channing being added to the Committee, on account of the lamented death of Mr. Dexter. We produced the fifth volume in April, 1889, and were at once authorized to publish another, for which we had already made considerable preparation, and which could have been ready by January, 1891. It occurred to us, however, that this would be the Centennial anniversary of the Society, and that it would be more appropriate if the Centennial volume of Collections should consist of additional selections from the Belknap Papers, Dr. Jeremy Belknap being generally recognized as our founder. We accordingly laid aside the Winthrop volume for the time being, but resumed work upon it last spring, and it is to-day ready for distribution.

Setting aside the separate publications of Mr. Savage and of my father, there are thus in print six volumes of Collections wholly devoted to selections from the Winthrop Papers, while fully the equivalent of a seventh is to be found scattered through other publications of the Society, and consists of material communicated at monthly meetings or contributed to other volumes of Collections. It is very difficult to make even a rough estimate of how many more will be required, so many letters of subordinate historical importance having thus far received only a cursory examination. It may turn out that three more volumes will suffice, after setting aside a variety of

manuscripts which might separately be communicated to the Proceedings ; and in such case one of these volumes would necessarily be somewhat miscellaneous in its character, while the other two would chiefly consist of letters addressed to John Winthrop, Jr., during his Governorship of Connecticut. The reason why I am indisposed to have the Society take any further steps in the matter for several years to come, if not longer, lies in the extreme difficulty, if not impossibility, of getting together at present a thoroughly satisfactory Committee,—that is to say, three Resident Members interested in the Colonial period, with some experience in editing and a reasonable amount of leisure to devote to it. Those who are most competent are, as a rule, engrossed by other occupations, and the duties of a Committee on Collections are more laborious than those of a Committee on Proceedings. The latter have their work cut out for them. They are chiefly occupied in editing papers communicated by others ; and when a member presents a communication, he is ordinarily expected to afford some assistance in seeing it through the press. A Committee on Collections gets no such help ; and each member of it, if he is to be really useful, must be prepared, not merely to run his eye over proof-sheets, but to burrow among original material, which is often very difficult to decipher. When the second Winthrop Committee was appointed, twelve years ago, we secured an eminently fit colleague in the late Mr. Dexter ; but his health failed shortly after, he was able to do very little, and we subsequently had great difficulty in replacing him. We finally enlisted a capable recruit in the person of Professor Channing, whose apparently rude health seemed to us of happy augury ; but, as ill-luck would have it, his duties at Harvard gradually increased to such an extent that he became of little use to us. This increasing scarcity of available volunteers has been such that the Society reluctantly adopted a plan, which has now been in operation for two years and a half, of employing a superintendent of publication to relieve all Committees whatsoever of the most fatiguing part of their work. The member appropriately intrusted with these functions happened to be the one who had long been the main-stay of the Winthrop Committee ; and he can no longer be relied on for assistance in this direction, unless it falls within the line of his official duties, as was fortunately the case with

the present volume. I therefore prefer to revert, for the next few years, to the original method of conducting the publication single-handed, in the hope that I may obtain some aid outside the Resident membership of the Society. This arrangement, moreover, will leave me free, upon my own responsibility and at my own expense, to try the experiment of a few changes in the method of publication which have long seemed to me desirable, but which need not be repeated if they do not commend themselves to the readers of the next volume. One of these changes is in the matter of *extracts*. The traditions of the Society are opposed to printing extracts in its volumes of Collections,—the rule, with rare exceptions, having been to print a manuscript in full, or not at all. There can be no question that this is the proper course to pursue in dealing with historical material of the highest order; but it is an inconvenient rule to apply to papers of subordinate importance, where numerous letters by the same person have to be winnowed and sifted. It not infrequently results either in printing wearisome letters, of which only two or three sentences are of any value, or in depriving a student of a few sentences which might materially assist him. In the last two volumes of Winthrop Papers a limited number of such extracts were inserted at my desire, but generally in the foot-notes; my present purpose is to print in the text of the succeeding volume a very much larger number, as I have derived great benefit and instruction from similar extracts furnished in the Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission and in various Calendars of State Papers issued by the British Government.

Another change is in the method of annotation. The Society's footnotes are often of considerable value and importance; but the almost invariable rule has been to print them in the type technically known as *bourgeois*, a type three sizes smaller than the text of the Collections. To persons whose sight is good this matters little; but to the army of short-sighted readers, myself included, *bourgeois* is a decided inconvenience; and my intention is to substitute for it the type known as *long primer*, as was done by the editors of the ninth volume of our First Series. In this matter of type, moreover, I wish to leave myself free to adopt a more radical change if I see fit. When the original Committee entered upon their duties, my father

suggested that the type he was about using in his separate publication of Governor Winthrop's letters, and already used by Mr. Savage for the Governor's Journal (the type known as *small pica*), would be sufficiently large for the purpose, in view of the exceptional amount of matter to be printed. Mr. Deane, however, preferred to adhere to the more imposing type known as *pica*, on the ground that it had long become the traditional type of the Society's Collections, as it has since continued to be with one important exception. In 1868, the Committee on the Mather Papers (Dr. Robbins, Professor Torrey, and Dr. Lothrop) took the responsibility of printing the result of their labors in small pica, in order to produce a single volume for convenient reference, rather than divide homogeneous material; and I prefer to be at liberty to follow their example, should it hereafter appear desirable. I realize how hazardous a thing it is for an elderly gentleman to undertake to tell a Society what he intends to do in the future, when the uncertainties of life and health are such that he may end by doing little or nothing; but, in any event, it may be convenient to some succeeding Committee to know what I had in view, even if they do not carry out my plans.

It occurs to me to add, in conclusion, that my father and I have never felt any special sense of obligation to the Society at large for spending so much money in publishing these papers. We have considered that in so doing they merely fulfilled one of the principal objects for which the Society was founded, and that we furnished an ample *quid pro quo*. But, on the other hand, we have always felt the strongest obligation to those members who, at different periods, have voluntarily devoted so much time and trouble to participation in this undertaking, and to three of them in particular. First of all, I need hardly say, to Mr. Savage, who worked at a period when hardly a tenth part of the authorities for reference now in existence were available, and when the duties of an editor were necessarily far more laborious than at present; next to him, to Mr. Charles Deane, whose accurate judgment and familiarity with early New England history made his advice and assistance of the utmost importance; and, in succession to Mr. Deane, to our Treasurer, Mr. Charles C. Smith, who has served on the Committee on the Winthrop Papers longer than any one else, and has given to his editorial duties a degree of

careful attention which few of us properly appreciate. The co-operation of my father and myself in this work has been largely due to family associations; but the three gentlemen I have named labored solely for the love of history. The preference of Mr. Savage for a separate form of publication identifies him permanently with it; but the mere mention in different volumes of the names of Mr. Deane and Mr. Smith as members of a publishing Committee conveys no adequate idea of the value of services to which I gladly take this opportunity of paying a passing tribute.

It was voted that the stated meetings for July, August, and September should be omitted, but that the President and Recording Secretary should have authority to call a special meeting during the intermission, if they should deem it expedient.

Mr. George S. Merriam, of Springfield, was elected a Resident Member.

A new serial of the Proceedings, covering the meetings in March, April, and May, was ready for delivery at this meeting. It comprised, among other matters, a diary of Rev. Eli Forbes, referring to which the Rev. Dr. LUCIUS R. PAIGE mentioned some very amusing variations in the name now written Forbes. While engaged in preparing his "History of Cambridge," he had seen the name spelled Farrabas, Farrow-bush, Forbas, Forbus, Forbush, and Forbes.